



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,670	12/14/2001	Agathe Subtil	216907US0X	4884
22850	7590	02/10/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.				FORD, VANESSA L
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1645		

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,670	SUBTIL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Vanessa L. Ford	1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 and 11-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>12/14/01</u> .	6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>Sequence Form</i> .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 7-10 filed on October 30, 2003 is acknowledged. Claims 1-6 and 11-29 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

2. The use of the trademarks have been noted in this application. See pages 26 and 36. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

3. This application also fails to comply the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825 because it contains nucleic acid sequences that are not identified. For example, page 27 contain sequences that are not identified. The Drawings contain sequences that have not been identified. See for example, Figures 2 and 3. The specification also refers to chimeras on pages 35-36 which have not been identified by sequence identifiers (i.e. SEQ ID NOs:). Appropriate sequence identifiers should be used to comply with sequence rules. The sequences in the specification should match the sequence listing and computer readable form (CRF) submitted with the application. See the attachment.

4. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See pages 29 and 35-36. The embedded hyperlink can be readily changed and therefore, may not be available to the public. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Because it is not clear that cell lines possessing the properties of *Chlamydia pneumoniae* strain TW183 are known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated from nature without undue experimentation and because the claims require the use of a suitable deposit for patent purposes a deposit in a public repository is required. Without a publicly available deposit of the *Chlamydia pneumoniae* strain TW183 above, one of ordinary skill in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of the cell line is an unpredictable event. Applicant's

referral to the deposit of *Chlamydia pneumoniae* strain TW183 on page 26 of the specification is an insufficient assurance that all required deposits have been made and all the conditions of 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 have been met. If the deposit has been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, filing of an affidavit or declaration by applicant or assignees or a statement by an attorney of record who has authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number stating that the deposit has been accepted by the International Depository Authority under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty and that all restrictions upon public access to the deposit will be irrevocably removed upon the grant of a patent on this application. These requirements are necessary when deposits are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty as the Treaty leaves this specific matter to the discretion of each State. Amendment of the specification to recite the date of the deposit and the complete name and full street address of the depository is required.

If the deposits have not been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits comply with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809, assurances regarding availability and permanency of deposits are required. Such assurance may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or assignees or in the form of a statement by an attorney of record who has the authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number averring:

(a) during the pendency of this application, access to the deposits will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;

- (b) all restrictions upon the availability to the public of the deposited biological material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent on this application;
- (c) the deposits will be maintained in the public repository for a period of at least thirty years from the date of deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of five years after the date of the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited biological material, whichever is longest; and
- (d) the deposits will be replaced if they should become nonviable or non-replicable.

In addition, a deposit of biological material that is capable of self-replication either directly or indirectly must be viable at the time of deposit and during the term of deposit. Viability may be tested by the repository. The test must conclude only that the deposited material is capable of reproduction. A viability statement for each deposit of biological material not made under the Budapest Treaty must be filed in the application and must contain:

- 1) The name and address of the depository;
- 2) The name and address of the depositor;
- 3) The date of deposit;
- 4) The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
- 5) The date of the viability test;
- 6) The procedures used to obtain a sample if test is not done by the depository; and
- 7) A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit. If the deposit was made after the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate

that the *Chlamydia pneumoniae* strain TW183 described in the specification as filed is the same as that deposited in the depository. Corroboration may take the form of a showing a chain of custody from applicant to the depository coupled with corroboration that the deposit is identical to the biological material described in the specification and in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed. Applicant's attention is directed to In re Lundack, 773 F.2d.1216, 227 USPQ (CAFC 1985) and 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 for further information concerning deposit practice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by Bannantine et al (*Cellular Microbiology*, 2, 35-47, February 2000).

Claims 7-8 are drawn to a method for identifying a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide wherein said method comprises (a) providing a recombinant expression vector containing at least DNA coding for the peptide of interest, (b) transforming a Gram-negative strain containing a type III secretion pathway with said recombinant vector; (c) expressing said vector in said Gram-negative transformed strain; and (d) detecting the secretion of said DNA expression product; wherein the secretion of said expression product indicates that it corresponds to a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide.

Bannantine et al teach a method of identifying secreted *Chlamydia* proteins (see the Abstract). Bannantine et al teach that the method includes: (a) obtaining *Chlamydia* cultures (obtained from strain TW-183) (page 46); (b) amplifying the candidate inc genes (inclusion membrane) using primers; (c) transforming the amplified products into pMAL-c2 (vector); and (d) overexpressing the products in *E. coli* (a gram-negative strain that contains a type III secretion pathway) and expressing a purified fusion product and using monoclonal antibodies to detect whether the secretion of DNA expressed product indicates that it corresponds to a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide (pages 46-47).

Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicant's method with the method of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed method and the method of the prior art (i.e., that the method of the prior art does not possess the same material method steps and parameters of the claimed method). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Bannantine et al (*Cellular Microbiology*, 2, 35-47, February 2000) in view of Demers et al (WO 99/58714, published November 18, 1999).

Claims 7-10 are drawn to a method for identifying a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide wherein said method comprises (a) providing a recombinant expression vector containing at least DNA coding for the peptide of interest, (b) transforming a Gram-negative strain containing a type III secretion pathway with said recombinant vector; (c) expressing said vector in said Gram-negative transformed strain; and (d) detecting the secretion of said DNA expression product; wherein the secretion of said expression product indicates that it corresponds to a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide.

Bannantine et al teach a method of identifying secreted *Chlamydia* proteins (see the Abstract). Bannantine et al teach that the proteins identified and characterized novel proteins localized to the chlamydial inclusion membrane and demonstrate the existence of potential secondary structural target motif for localization of chlamydial proteins to this unique intracellular environment (page 35). Bannantine et al teach that the method includes: (a) obtaining *Chlamydia* cultures (obtained from strain TW-183) (page 46); (b) amplifying the candidate inc genes using primers; (c) transforming the amplified products into pMAL-c2 (vector); and (d) overexpressing the products in *E. coli* (a gram-negative strain that contains a type III secretion pathway) and expressing a purified fusion product and using monoclonal antibodies to detect whether the secretion of DNA expressed product indicates that it corresponds to a secreted *Chlamydia* polypeptide (pages 46-47).

Bannantine et al do not teach a *Shigella* strain as a gram-negative strain containing a type III secretion pathway.

Demers et al teach that *Shigella* bacteria are gram-negative organisms that contain type III secretion machinery (page 1). Demers et al teach the use of *Shigella* bacteria in methods of exposing gram-negative bacterial cells to a sample molecule wherein the bacterial cells contain a reporter gene transcriptionally fused to a promoter of a gene activated or regulated by the type III secretion machinery and detecting the presence or activity of the product of the reporter gene (see the Abstract and pages 2-3).

It would be *prima facie* obvious at the time the invention was made to substitute the *E. coli* strain as taught by Bannantine et al in the method of identifying *Chlamydia* polypeptides with the *Shigella* strain because Demers et al teach that gram-negative bacteria from the genera *Shigella*, *Salmonella*, *Yersinia*, *Escherichia*, *Pseudomonas*, *Xanthomonas*, *Ralstonia* and *Erwinia* can be used to create fusion constructs because they contain the type III secretion machinery (page 3). It would be expected barring evidence to the contrary that *Shigella* bacteria comprising type III secretion machinery would be effective in identifying secreted proteins.

Status of Claims

8. No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry of the general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Office Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for the Group 1600 is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Vanessa L. Ford, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0857. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-0864.


Vanessa L. Ford
Biotechnology Patent Examiner
February 4, 2004

L. F. S
LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPPLY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPPLY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600